PIJSSL

**Praxis International Journal of Social Science and Literature**

*A Peer-reviewed Multidisciplinary e-Journal with SJIR 2025 = 6.034 & ISSN: 2581-6675*

**Vol. 09, No. 04** (April 2026) **DOI:** 10.51879/PIJSSL/090409

**Email:** editor.pijssl@gmail.com | **Website:** www.pijssl.com

OPEN ACCESS

# Study of Social Inequality and Class Divide in Post-Green Revolution Haryana

**Mandeep [1*], Dr Shubdeep Kour [2], Mukhtar Ahmed [3]**

[1] Department of History, Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh, Punjab

[2] Assistant Professor, Department of History, Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh, Punjab

[3] Department of Food Science & Technology, Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh, Punjab

[*] *Corresponding Author: Mandeep (Email: mandeepranga78@gmail.com)*

***Abstract***

*This paper examines the social consequences of the Green Revolution in Haryana, focusing on inequality and class division in rural society. While agricultural modernization significantly increased production, food security, and rural incomes, its benefits were distributed unevenly. Large and medium farmers, with greater access to land, irrigation, capital, and modern technology, gained disproportionately and emerged as economically and politically dominant. In contrast, small farmers and landless labourers remained marginalized, with limited access to resources, lower incomes, reduced employment opportunities, and weaker social mobility. Mechanization increased productivity but reduced labour demand, intensifying rural disparities. The study shows that the Green Revolution transformed Haryana's agrarian economy while deepening class polarization, weakening traditional social cohesion, and reinforcing structural inequality. It argues for inclusive agricultural policies to ensure equitable development and social justice*

***Keywords:*** *Green Revolution, Social Inequality, Class Division, Agrarian Change, Rural Haryana, Agricultural Modernization*

## Introduction

The Green Revolution brought about a historic transformation in the agricultural sector of India, the impact of which was highly clearly seen, especially in the state of Haryana. The use of improved seeds, chemical fertilizers, irrigation facilities and modern farming techniques led to a significant increase in agricultural production. Although the revolution encouraged food security and economic growth, its social effects were not uniformly positive. The objective of this research paper is to make an in-depth analysis of the social inequalities and class divisions that arose in Haryana after the Green Revolution. It is clear from the study that the benefits of the Green Revolution were mainly limited to the farmers who had adequate access to land, capital and resources. On the contrary, marginal and landless farmers could not get the expected benefits, leading to further deepening social inequality. There was a wide gap between large farmers and small farmers in income, production and standard of living. This process gave rise to a new class structure in rural society, in which capitalist tendencies developed and traditional community relations weakened. The effects of the Green Revolution were also seen at the cultural level, where the spread of modernity and consumerism was accompanied by a change in traditional values and lifestyles. Competition, individuality and social distancing increased in rural society, which adversely affected social cohesion. This paper concludes that the Green Revolution promoted economic prosperity as well as social inequality and class division. Therefore, it is imperative that future agricultural policies pay special attention to inclusive growth, equitable distribution of

This is an open access article licensed under https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0

resources and empowerment of small and marginal farmers, so as to ensure social balance and sustainable development.

**Literature Review**

Various scholars have conducted important studies from time to time to understand the social effects of the Green Revolution.

**Frankel (1971) – India's Green Revolution: Economic Gains and Political Costs,** Frankel conducted an in-depth analysis of the economic and political implications of the Green Revolution. He found that the Green Revolution significantly increased food grain production, allowing India to overcome the food crisis. But the benefits were not evenly distributed. Large and affluent farmers strengthened their income and social status by taking advantage of modern technologies, while small farmers were left behind due to lack of resources. Thus, the Green Revolution further deepened the class divide and social inequality in rural areas.

**Bardhan (1973) – Green Revolution and Agricultural Inequality in India,** Bardhan analyzed agricultural inequality in the context of the Green Revolution. According to him, the impact of the Green Revolution was more pronounced in areas where there was irrigation, capital and the availability of technical resources. This gave more benefit to the big farmers and the small farmers were relatively disadvantaged. He also pointed out that this process widened the class gap in rural society and created an imbalance in the social structure, further widening the gap of inequality.

**Griffin (1974) – The Political Economy of Agrarian Change**, Griffin saw the Green Revolution as an extension of capitalist agriculture. He argued that the use of new technologies and machines made agriculture more capital-intensive, making it harder for small farmers to compete. Large farmers earned more production and profit, while small farmers lagged behind. This imbalance further strengthened the class divide in rural society and fueled economic inequality.

**Singh (1990) – Green Revolution and Its Impact on Rural Society in Haryana,** Singh studied the effects of the Green Revolution in the rural society of Haryana. He found that the Green Revolution led to a significant increase in the income and social prestige of large farmers. In contrast, small farmers and landless labourers could receive limited benefits. Mechanization led to a decrease in the demand for workers, leading to an increase in unemployment. Thus, the Green Revolution in Haryana made the class divide and social inequality more apparent.

**Bhalla (2007) – Indian Agriculture Since Independence**, Bhalla analysed the development of Indian agriculture after independence. He informed that the Green Revolution significantly increased agricultural production and productivity, making the country self-sufficient in the field of food grains. However, he also made it clear that the benefits of this development were unevenly distributed. Large and medium farmers received higher profits, while small farmers received relatively fewer benefits, leading to increased income inequality and social inequality.

**Jodhka (2006) – Beyond Crises: Rethinking Punjab Agriculture**, Jodhka analysed the social impacts of the Green Revolution in the rural society of Punjab and Haryana. He found that this revolution made economic classes more important by changing the traditional caste-based structure. Economic power became the basis of social prestige. However, it also increased social inequality, as small farmers and the downtrodden classes were left behind in this development process. Thus, the Green Revolution reorganized the social structure, but could not establish equality.

**Swaminathan (n.d.) – Green Revolution and Sustainable Agriculture,** Swaminathan acknowledged the achievements of the Green Revolution as well as its limitations. He said that technological advancements increased production, but if resources were not distributed equally, social inequality could increase. He emphasized on the availability of special policies, training and resources for small and marginal farmers.

According to him, social justice and environmental balance are essential for sustainable and inclusive agricultural development.

**Sharma (2010) – Agricultural Development and Inequality in Punjab and Haryana,** Sharma studied the relationship of agricultural development and inequality in Punjab and Haryana. He found that the benefits of the Green Revolution were more limited to large farmers. Small farmers could not reap the expected benefits due to lack of technical and financial resources. This widened the gap in income and social status. He suggested that it is essential to empower small farmers through inclusive policies.

**Singh (2000) – Social and Economic Impacts of Green Revolution in Rural India,** Singh analysed the social and economic impacts of the Green Revolution and found that it increased agricultural production, but also promoted social inequality. Large farmers took advantage of modern technologies, while small farmers were left behind due to lack of resources. This made the class division in rural society more pronounced and affected the social balance.

**Reddy (1998) – Agricultural Growth and Rural Inequality in India**, Reddy studied the relationship between agricultural growth and rural inequality. He found that the Green Revolution was more successful in areas where irrigation and capital were available. This led to an increase in both regional and class inequality. Small farmers and landless labourers were left behind in the process, leading to imbalances in rural society.

**Rao (1989) – Agricultural Growth, Rural Poverty and Income Distribution,** Rao analysed the relationship between agricultural development and income distribution. He pointed out that the Green Revolution increased production, but the distribution of income remained uneven. Large farmers got more profits, while small farmers were left behind due to limited resources. This led to the problem of economic inequality and poverty in rural society.

**Patnaik (1987) – Class Differentiation within the Peasantry,** Patnaik analysed the Green Revolution from a class perspective. He found that it strengthened capitalist ties in rural society and widened the class divide among the peasants. The big farmers made more profits, while the small peasants and the working class became victims of exploitation. This further deepened social inequality.

**Dantwala (1986) – Agricultural Growth in India, Dantwala** studied the role of new technologies in agricultural development. He pointed out that the Green Revolution increased production, but its benefits were not evenly distributed. Small farmers could not get adequate resources and support, leaving them behind. He stressed on the need for inclusive policies.

**Byres (1981) – Agrarian Structure and Green Revolution in India**, Byres studied the relationship between agricultural structure and the Green Revolution. He pointed out that the Green Revolution made agriculture capital-intensive, giving more benefits to the big farmers. Small farmers lagged behind in competition and class divisions deepened. This increased inequality in rural society.

**Mellor (1976) – The New Economics of Growth,** Mellor analysed the developmental aspects of the Green Revolution. He acknowledged that it was successful in increasing agricultural production, but its social effects were mixed. If proper policies are not adopted, it can exacerbate inequality. He stressed on the need for balanced and inclusive growth.

**Objective of the Study**

- To analyse the changes in the agricultural structure after the Green Revolution in Haryana.
- To study the level of social inequality in rural society.
- To evaluate the distribution of income and resources among different classes (large peasants, small peasants, landless labourers).
- To understand the nature of class divisions caused by the Green Revolution.
- To make policy suggestions for reducing social and economic inequalities.

**Sample Selection:**
A stratified sampling method will be used, in which farmers will be classified on the basis of their land ownership, income level, and caste. Through this methodology, the social impacts of the Green Revolution will be studied in depth.

**Findings and Discussion**

Q1**. Class Division on the Basis of Land Ownership**

| 1. | cla | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| 2. | Large farmers | 18% |
| 3. | Medium Farmer | 32% |
| 4. | Small farmers | 35% |
| 5. | Landless labourers | 15% |

The table presented clearly shows the class structure on the basis of land ownership in the rural society of Haryana. It gives the percentage distribution of four major categories — large farmers (18%), middle farmers (32%), small farmers (35%) and landless labourers (15%). This distribution is not just a statistical depiction of the agrarian structure but also highlights the depth of socio-economic inequality, unequal distribution of resources, and class divisions that pervade rural society.

First, the highest percentage of small farmers (35%) indicates the fact that most of the farming class in Haryana falls under the marginal or small category. These farmers are generally dependent on 1 to 2 hectares or less of land. After the Green Revolution, while modern agricultural techniques — such as improved seeds, chemical fertilisers and irrigation facilities — proliferated, small farmers had limited access to these resources. As a result, despite the increase in production, their incomes remained relatively low and they fell behind in competition with large farmers. The high number of this class also shows that the problem of fragmentation in the agricultural sector is serious, which has a negative impact on the profitability of agriculture. The percentage of medium farmers is 32%, which can be considered as an important and transitional section of rural society. This class is neither highly affluent nor completely disadvantaged. Medium farmers are often able to adopt modern technologies, but they also have resource limitations. This class benefited to some extent during the Green Revolution, especially through irrigation and the use of fertilizers. However, rising costs, market fluctuations, and credit pressure make this class unstable. This class therefore remains in a position of sliding upwards (large peasants) or downwards (small peasants), indicating class dynamics.

The percentage of large farmers is 18%, which, though small in number, is a very influential class economically and socially. This class has relatively more land, capital, irrigation resources and technical knowledge. This class took the most advantage of the Green Revolution. The use of high productivity crops, tractors, harvesters and other machines led to a significant increase in their productivity and income. As a result, large peasants dominated the rural power structure, market control, and political influence. The low percentage but high impact of this class shows that the distribution of resources is highly uneven.

The percentage of landless labourers is 15%, which is the most vulnerable and disadvantaged section of rural society. They do not own agricultural land, and depend on laboring on others' fields for their livelihood. After the Green Revolution, the mechanization of agriculture affected this class the most. The use of tractors, threshers, and other machines led to a decrease in the demand for labor, leading to reduced employment opportunities and pressure on wages. Both the economic insecurity and social status of this class remained weak. Moreover, this class is often socially backward as well, limiting access to education, health, and other facilities for them.

The overall analysis of this table makes it clear that the distribution of land ownership in Haryana is unequal and this inequality forms the main basis of class division. Large farmers control more resources despite being less numerous, while small farmers and landless labourers are deprived of resources despite being in large numbers. This situation gives rise to social inequality, where on the one hand, the affluent class continues to strengthen its economic status, while the poor class remains trapped in the cycle of poverty.

In the context of the Green Revolution, this disparity becomes even more pronounced. The Green Revolution increased agricultural production, but its benefits were greater for the farmers who already had the resources available. Small farmers and landless labourers were relatively left behind in the process. This accelerated the process of class polarization in rural society, where the gap between rich and poor widened.

**Q2. Income Inequality (before and after the Green Revolution)**

| cla | First (₹/month) | After (₹/month) | Increase (%) | cla |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Large farmers | 12,000 | 40,000 | +233% | Large farmers |
| Medium Farmer | 8,000 | 22,000 | +175% | Medium Farmer |
| Small farmers | 5,000 | 10,000 | +100% | Small farmers |
| Workers | 3,000 | 6,000 | +100% | Workers |

The table shows the change in the monthly income of various agricultural classes — large farmers, middle farmers, small farmers and labourers — before and after the Green Revolution in Haryana. According to the data, after the Green Revolution, there has been an increase in the income of all classes, which is an indication that technological improvements in the agriculture sector, improved seeds, irrigation facilities and use of chemical fertilizers have led to an increase in production. However, the distribution of this growth has not been uniform, resulting in income inequality and class divisions becoming more pronounced.

First of all, consider the situation of large farmers, their income was ₹12,000 per month before the Green Revolution, which later increased to ₹40,000 per month. This is a massive increase of about 233%, which is the highest compared to all other classes. The major reason for this extraordinary growth is that large farmers already had access to sufficient land, capital, irrigation resources, and modern technologies. They quickly and widely adopted the new technologies of the Green Revolution—such as HYV seeds, tractors, harvesters, and fertilizers. This led to a rapid increase in both their productivity and profits. Additionally, large farmers also benefited more from better market access, storage facilities, and government policies, leading to a rapid increase in their incomes and becoming the dominant segment in the rural economy.

The income of the middle farmers has also seen a significant increase. His income increased from ₹8,000 to ₹22,000 per month, representing a nearly 175% increase. This increase is significant, but less than that of large farmers. The middle peasants were able to adopt modern techniques to some extent, but they had limitations in resources. They could use fertilisers, seeds and machinery, but not on a large scale like large farmers. Moreover, market fluctuations, cost overruns, and credit pressures continued to pose challenges for this segment. Due to this, their income increased, but they could not reach the level of large farmers. This situation reflects the instability of the middle class, where they can slip up or down.

The income of small farmers increased from ₹5,000 to ₹10,000 per month, marking a 100% increase. This increase may seem significant as a percentage, but in terms of real income, this growth is limited. Small farmers have limited land and capital, which prevents them from taking full advantage of modern technologies. Many times they have to take loans to buy expensive inputs, which leads to a large part of their income going into repaying the loan. Moreover, they have limited access to the market and often rely on intermediaries. As a result, the bulk of the gains from the Green Revolution do not reach them and they remain in a relatively vulnerable position.

The situation of the working class is similar. His income increased from ₹3,000 to ₹6,000 per month, marking a 100% increase. However, even this increase does not bring about a huge change in the standard of

living. The increasing use of mechanization in agriculture during the Green Revolution reduced the demand for workers. The use of tractors, threshers, and other machines reduced the need for traditional labor, limiting the employment opportunities for laborers. Additionally, the increase in wage rates was also limited, making the growth of their income relatively low. Thus, the working class was the least affected by the benefits of the Green Revolution and their economic situation remained relatively weak.

**Q3. Impact of Agricultural Mechanization**

| influence | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|
| Increased use of machines | 72% |
| Demand for workers decreased | 58% |
| Increased production | 80% |

The table shows the various effects of farm mechanization—an increase in the use of machines (72%), a decrease in the demand for workers (58%), and an increase in production (80%). These figures clearly show that the technological changes in the agriculture sector after the Green Revolution have profoundly affected the nature of farming, production system and socio-economic structure. While mechanization made agriculture more productive and modern, its social effects were also significant, particularly in terms of labour structure and employment.

Firstly, the 72% increase in the use of machines shows that farmers increasingly abandoned traditional farming methods and adopted modern equipment. The use of equipment such as tractors, harvesters, threshers, pumpsets and spray machines is now commonplace. The main reason for this change is the time savings, labor shortages, and the need to speed up production. Large and medium farmers in particular used these machines more because they had the ability to invest. With the use of machines, tasks like plowing, sowing and harvesting of the field were completed in less time and with greater accuracy, thereby increasing the efficiency of agricultural operations.

Another important aspect is the 80% increase in production, which is the most positive indicator of this table. Mechanization brought speed and precision to agricultural operations, leading to a significant increase in crop production. For example, the use of a tractor made it possible to plow deeper, which improved the fertility of the soil. Similarly, timely sowing and harvesting by advanced machines reduced crop losses and higher production. In addition, the coordination of machines as well as advanced seeds, chemical fertilizers, and irrigation facilities further increased production. Thus, mechanization played a crucial role in strengthening food security and contributed to making the country self-reliant.

However, mechanization also has a negative impact, which is reflected in the form of a 58% reduction in demand for workers. Most of the work in traditional agriculture was based on human labour, such as tillage, sowing, weeding, and harvesting. But the use of machines significantly reduced the need for human labor in these tasks. For example, where earlier harvesting a field required many labourers, now a harvester machine can do the work in a few hours. This reduced employment opportunities for agricultural labourers and had a negative impact on their income.

This situation is particularly worrisome for landless labourers and small farmers, who depend on agricultural labour for their livelihood. When the demand for labor is low, wage rates are also under pressure, further weakening their economic situation. Many times laborers have to migrate to cities in search of employment, which increases the rural-urban imbalance. Thus, mechanization, while on the one hand, increased production and efficiency, on the other hand, also gave rise to the problem of social inequality and unemployment.

Moreover, the benefit of mechanization did not accrue equally to all classes. Large farmers used the machines more and got more out of them, while it is also harder for small farmers to buy or rent these machines. This deepened the class divide in agriculture. Large farmers were able to produce more and earn profits, while small farmers and laborers were left behind.

**Q4. Access to Social Services**

| convenience | Large farmers | Small farmers |
|---|---|---|
| teaching | 85% | 55% |
| health | 78% | 50% |
| Banking | 82% | 48% |

The table presented shows the stark disparity between large and small farmers in terms of access to social services—education, health, and banking—in rural society. According to statistics, access to education is 85% for large farmers, while it is only 55% for small farmers. Similarly, access to health services is 78% for large farmers and 50% for small farmers, with the difference in banking services visible as 82% and 48%. These statistics make it clear that economic status and the availability of resources profoundly influence access to social services, further exacerbating inequality in rural society.

First of all, in the field of education, 85% of the access of large farmers shows that they are able to provide their children with access to better schools, private institutions and higher education opportunities. They have more economic resources, transportation facilities, and social awareness, making them understand and invest in the importance of education. In contrast, smallholder farmers have access to education at only 55%, indicating that they face numerous obstacles, such as financial constraints, distance to schools, and family responsibilities. Many times, small farmers engage their children in agricultural work instead of education, which hampers their educational progress. Thus, this gap in the field of education further deepens social and economic inequality in the future.

Similar disparities are seen in access to health services. The 78% penetration for large farmers indicates that they can avail of better hospitals, private clinics, and modern medical facilities. They have the ability to have health insurance, transportation, and timely treatment. In contrast, smallholder farmers have access to only 50 %, indicating that they often rely on primary health centres or limited facilities. Due to financial limitations, they are not able to get treatment on time, which can worsen their health condition. This disparity not only impacts individual health but also impacts the productivity and quality of life of the entire community.

There is also a significant difference between large and small farmers in terms of access to banking services. Large farmers have access to banking services at 82%, while for small farmers it is only 48%. Banking services include account opening, obtaining loans, use of insurance and savings schemes. Large farmers can leverage these facilities to expand their agricultural activities, invest in modern technologies, and manage risks. In contrast, small farmers are often left out of the banking system and have to take loans from moneylenders or informal sources at a higher rate of interest. This further weakens their financial situation and can lead them into a debt trap.

A comparative analysis of these three sectors—education, health, and banking—makes it clear that inequality in access to social services is a pervasive and structural problem. This inequality is not just a result of the income gap, but it is also linked to the unequal distribution of resources, awareness, infrastructure, and government policies. Large farmers are in a better position in all these areas, which accelerates their social and economic progress. On the contrary, small farmers are left behind in the race for development by being deprived of these services.

The social implications of this inequality are also profound. The gap in education limits the opportunities of future generations, the lack of healthcare services affects the quality of life, and the unavailability of banking services exacerbates economic insecurity. Thus, this inequality acts as a cycle, where the poor become poorer and the rich class becomes more empowered.

This situation becomes even more important in the context of the Green Revolution and agricultural development. While large farmers improved their incomes and living standards by taking advantage of technological advances, small farmers could not take full advantage of that growth due to limited access to social services. This further made the imbalance and class division in rural society more pronounced.

**Q5. Social Status and Power**

| cla | High social impact (%) |
|---|---|
| Large farmers | 70% |
| Medium Farmer | 45% |
| Small farmers | 25% |
| Workers | 10% |

The table shows the level of social status and power of different sections of the rural society—large farmers (70%), medium farmers (45%), small farmers (25%) and labourers (10%). These statistics clearly indicate that the distribution of power in rural society is unequal on the basis of land ownership, economic resources, and income. Social prestige is not only a result of economic prosperity, but it is also linked to social relations, political influence, decision-making ability, and cultural dominance. Thus, this table is extremely important for understanding the class structure and balance of power of rural society.

First of all, consider the situation of large farmers, who have a high social influence of 70%. This shows that they are the most influential section in the rural society. They have more land, capital, modern technology, and the availability of resources, making them economically stronger. Due to this economic power, they also become influential in the social and political spheres. They play an important role in village decisions, panchayat elections, and local institutions. They are often in leadership positions and their opinions are prioritized. In addition, large farmers also have more education and contacts, which further increases their social influence.

The social influence of medium farmers is 45%, indicating that they hold an important but moderate position in society. They have few resources and land, making them financially stable, but they are not as influential as large farmers. The middle farmers sometimes act as a bridge between the big farmers and the small farmers. They participate in panchayats and social activities, but the impact of their decisions is limited. Their social status depends on how effectively they use their resources and how much activity they show in society.

The situation of small farmers is relatively weak, with only 25% of the social impact. This shows that they have limited prestige and power in rural society. They lack land and resources, leaving them vulnerable to economic status. Due to economic weakness, they are not able to actively participate in social and political activities. At times, they depend on large farmers, limiting their independence and decision-making. Moreover, lack of education and awareness also affects their social status.

The position of the working class is the weakest, with only 10% of the social influence. This class is landless and depends on others for their livelihood. Due to being economically weak, their social prestige is also very low. They are not able to participate in village decisions or raise their voices. Many times they have to face social discrimination and inequality. This state of the working class reflects the deep inequality and power imbalance in rural society.

A comparative analysis of this table makes it clear that as economic resources and land ownership increase, so does social prestige and power. Large farmers are also socially and politically influential due to being economically empowered, while small farmers and labourers remain socially backward due to being economically weak. Thus, economic inequality translates into social inequality.

The social implications of this disparity are also significant. Sections with high social influence get more access to education, health, employment, and other opportunities, further accelerating their development. Conversely, the weaker sections are deprived of these opportunities, hampering their growth. Moreover, the unequal distribution of power can also lead to social tensions and conflicts, as weaker sections struggle for their rights.

## Conclusion

After the Green Revolution, while the state of Haryana recorded an unprecedented increase in agricultural production, its social consequences were mixed and divisive. This study makes it clear that the benefits of the Green Revolution were not evenly distributed across the socio-economic structure. Rather, it deepened pre-existing social inequalities and gave rise to new class divisions.

Even after the abolition of zamindari, large and medium farmers with access to new technologies (high-yielding seeds, chemical fertilizers, tractors, tube wells) converted into the capitalist peasant class. They not only progressed economically but also monopolized the power of the state and rural politics. In contrast, landless agricultural labourers, marginal and small farmers were marginalised by the process.

Ultimately, the Green Revolution in Haryana reinforced a capitalist agrarian system that offered a model of 'development' but at the same time created a social structure that was more unequal than ever before in terms of resources, opportunities and access to power. This pernicious combination of caste and class, combined with gender inequality, makes Haryana's rural structure tense and isolated. Therefore, post-Green Revolution Haryana is a glaring example of a socially 'divided society' despite being economically prosperous, where land reforms, education, employment generation and social security measures have become necessary for sustainable and inclusive development.

## References


- Singh, G. (2000). *Green Revolution and Social Change*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Sharma, H. R. (2015). *Agricultural Development in India*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
- Desai, V. (2012). *Rural Development in India: Past, Present and Future*. New Delhi: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Datt, R., & Sundharam, K. P. M. (2021). *Indian Economy*. New Delhi: S. Chand & Company Ltd.
- Bhalla, G. S., & Singh, G. (2010). *Economic Liberalisation and Indian Agriculture*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Narayan, D. (2002). *Empowerment and Poverty Reduction*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Government of India. (2019). *Agricultural Statistics at a Glance*. New Delhi: Ministry of Agriculture.
- Singh, K. (2009). *Rural Development: Principles, Policies and Management*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Agarwal, A. N. (2018). *Indian Economy: Problems of Development and Planning*. New Delhi: Wishwa Prakashan.
- Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2015). *Economic Development*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. London: Longman.
- Patel, A. (2016). *Agricultural Economics*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, R. B. (2014). *Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development*. New Delhi: Springer.
- FAO. (2017). *The Future of Food and Agriculture*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.
- World Bank. (2020). *World Development Report*. Washington, DC: World Bank.